

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Santana Jade Cline, | : | |
| | : | |
| Plaintiff | : | Civil Action 2:13-cv-00401 |
| | : | |
| v. | : | Judge Graham |
| | : | |
| Mortgage Electronic Systems, Inc., | : | Magistrate Judge Abel |
| | : | |
| Defendant | : | |

ORDER

Plaintiff's June 12, 2013 motion to compel a corporate disclosure statement (doc. 8) is DENIED. Defendant filed a corporate disclosure statement June 13 (doc. 9).

Rule 7.1, Fed. R. Civ. P. requires corporate parties to file disclosure statements:

- (a) WHO MUST FILE; CONTENTS. A nongovernmental corporate party must file 2 copies of a disclosure statement that:
 - (1) identifies any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock; or
 - (2) states that there is no such corporation.
- (b) TIME TO FILE; SUPPLEMENTAL FILING. A party must:
 - (1) file the disclosure statement with its first appearance, pleading, petition, motion, response, or other request addressed to the court; and
 - (2) promptly file a supplemental statement if any required information changes.

The purpose of the disclosure requirement is explained in the Rules Committee's notes to the Rule:

The information required by Rule 7.1(a) reflects the "financial interest" standard of Canon 3C(1)(c) of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges. This information will support properly informed disqualification decisions

in situations that call for automatic disqualification under Canon 3C(1)(c).

The disclosures provides information to the judges assigned to the case, the parties, and the public necessary for the judges to meet their obligation under the judicial canons not to participate in a case in which they have a financial interest. Although defendant did not file the corporate disclosure statement when its counsel first entered an appearance, the purpose behind the Rule was satisfied when defendant's counsel filed the corporate disclosure statement the day after plaintiff filed her motion to compel. Neither plaintiff nor the public suffered any injury as a result of the short delay in filing the statement.

s/Mark R. Abel
United States Magistrate Judge